UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,985	02/20/2004	Robert S. Kolman	10030895-1	7147

63448 7590 02/20/2009

Gregory W. Osterloth
Holland & Hart, LLP
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, CO 80201

EXAMINER	
PILLAI, NAMITHA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/782,985	KOLMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NAMITHA PILLAI	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1 and 11* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-10 and 12-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's submission on 10/30/08 including amendments to claims 2-10, 12, 15, 18, 19, the withdrawal of claims 1 and 11, and the addition of new claims 20 and 21. Claims 2-10 and 12-21 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,111,561 (Brandau et al.), herein referred to as Brandau and U. S. Patent No. 7,047,463 B1 (Organ et al.), herein referred to as Organ.

Referring to claim 20, Brandau discloses a system having a display, a user interface, and a computer readable medium (Figure 1 and column 2, lines 38-46). The computer readable medium contains computer code to carry out the process claimed (column 2, lines 37-40), the computer program is stored on the computer system and executed to carry out the claimed features. Brandau discloses displaying a high-level map structure panel on the display on a first image scale (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 13-17). Brandau discloses displaying

a panning window on the display, the panning window being movable from a first position in the high-level map structure panel to a second position in the high-level map structure panel by way of a continuous panning motion from the first position to the second position to select a sub-portion of the displayed map structure (column 2, lines 56-64). The panner represents the panning window which when the user drags is movable from a first position to a second position in the Overview panel. This dragging is a continuous panning motion which selects a sub-portion of the displayed Overview map data. Brandau discloses displaying a detailed sub-structure panel on the display, the detailed sub-structure displaying the selected sub-portion of the map structure on a second image scale greater than the first image scale (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 19-26). The Detail window panel displays the selected sub-portion of the Overview window on a scale that is more detailed and greater than the first image scale. Brandau does not disclose a high level map display including a test flow map structure, which relates to a flow of tests for testing at least one device. Organ discloses displaying a test flow map structure which relates to a flow of tests for testing at least one device (Figure 5A and column 2, lines 8-12). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Organ a high level map display including a test flow map structure, which relates to a flow of tests for testing at least one device. Brandau discloses displaying network information that includes large amount of nodes for which a detailed display is provided. Brandau discloses that map structures with large amounts of nodes can be hard to examine for which the detailed display would come in handy

(column 1, lines 36-43). The test flow diagram in Organ includes such a map structure that includes large amount of nodes with details. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Organ a high level map display including a test flow map structure, which relates to a flow of tests for testing at least one device.

Referring to claim 21, Brandau discloses a method including displaying a map structure including data on a first image scale in a first area of the display (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 13-17). Brandau discloses providing a panning window which is movable from a first position in the high-level map structure panel to a second position in the high-level map structure panel by way of a continuous panning motion from the first position to the second position to select a sub-portion of the displayed map structure (column 2, lines 56-64). The panner represents the panning window which when the user drags is movable from a first position to a second position in the Overview panel. This dragging is a continuous panning motion which selects a sub-portion of the displayed Overview map data. Brandau discloses displaying the selected sub-portion of the map structure on a second image scale greater than the first image scale in a second area of the display screen (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 19-26). The Detail window panel displays the selected sub-portion of the Overview window on a scale that is more detailed and greater than the first image scale. Brandau does not disclose displaying a flow of tests for testing at least one device with a map structure of test data. Organ discloses displaying a flow of tests for testing at least one device with a map structure of test data (Figure 5A and column 2,

lines 8-12). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Organ displaying a flow of tests for testing at least one device with a map structure of test data. Brandau discloses displaying network information that includes large amount of nodes for which a detailed display is provided. Brandau discloses that map structures with large amounts of nodes can be hard to examine for which the detailed display would come in handy (column 1, lines 36-43). The test flow diagram in Organ includes such a map structure that includes large amount of nodes with details. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Organ displaying a flow of tests for testing at least one device with a map structure of test data.

3. Claims 3-10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandau, Organ and U. S. Publication No. 2004/0006425 A1 (Wood et al.), herein referred to as Wood.

Referring to claim 3, Brandau discloses distinct elements are highlighted in the map structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but does not disclose a search and highlight function, the search and highlight function allowing input of a search criteria, in a data entry manner and not solely from a predetermined menu of selectable search criteria and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the search criteria. Wood discloses a search and highlight function where in response to search criteria input by the user for displaying and identifying distinct data, these elements are highlighted in the map structure displayed in the high-

level map structure panel that meet the search criteria (Figures 9 and 10 and page 5, paragraph 42). The search input involves data entry of an address by a user and is not solely from a predetermined menu of searchable criteria. The address is searched and highlighted as an icon on the map to identify the found address. The search criteria is input by the user as shown in Figure 9, where its in a data entry manner and not solely from a predetermined menu of searchable criteria. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood a search and highlight function, the search and highlight function allowing input of a search criteria, in a data entry manner and not solely from a predetermined menu of selectable search criteria and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the search criteria. Brandau discloses an interface where network elements are configured and further highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements within a system. The configuration and management of this network would benefit from a search and highlight functionality that would allow for the user to search and identify specific elements within a large and clustered network. This provides motivation for Brandau and Organ to learn from Wood. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from Wood that a search and highlight function, the search and highlight function allowing input of a search criteria, in a data entry manner and not solely from a predetermined menu of selectable search criteria and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the search criteria.

Referring to claim 4, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose that the search and highlight function allows input of a plurality of search criteria and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the search criteria (Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30), where the search menu display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of search criteria that can be selected through inputs by the user with these elements being highlighted in the map structure.

Referring to claim 5, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose that the search and highlight function visually differentiates highlights generated according to respective search criteria (Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau and Wood disclose highlighting elements in response to respective search criteria. The combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood also discloses that the highlighted elements are color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there being a visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map structure and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 6, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose a graphical switch on the display that allows the search and highlight function to be activated or inactivated (Wood, page 5, paragraph 44, lines 1-3), where a graphical means is provided to switch to activating access to the search and highlight function.

Referring to claim 7, Brandau discloses highlighting distinct elements in the network structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but Brandau does not disclose a highlight function that allows input of a highlight selection criteria

and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight selection criteria. Wood discloses a highlight function which allows input of a highlight selection criteria in response to which elements can be highlighted in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight selection criteria (Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30). The selection criteria input into the menu of Figure 12 results in highlighting of these criteria in the map structure of Wood. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the highlight function allows input of a highlight selection criteria and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight selection criteria. Brandau discloses an interface where network elements are configured and further highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements within a system. The configuration and management of this network would benefit from highlighting elements in response to a highlight selection criteria functionality that would allow for the user to search and identify specific elements within a large and clustered network. This provides motivation for Brandau and Organ to learn from Wood. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from Wood that the highlight function allows input of a highlight selection criteria and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight selection criteria.

Referring to claim 8, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose that the highlight function allows input of a plurality of highlight selection criteria and highlights

elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight selection criteria (Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30), where the search menu display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of highlight selection criteria that can be selected through inputs by the user with these elements being highlighted in the map structure.

Referring to claim 9, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose that the highlight function visually differentiates elements highlighted according to different respective highlight selection criteria (Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose highlighting elements in response to respective highlight selection criteria. The combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood also discloses that the highlighted elements are color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there being a visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map structure and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 10, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose a graphical switch on the display that allows the highlight function to be activated or inactivated (Wood, page 5, paragraph 44, lines 1-3), where a graphical means is provided to switch to activating access to the highlight function.

Referring to claim 12, Brandau discloses highlighting elements in the map structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but does not disclose displaying a selectable search and highlight function that accepts search criteria input in a data entry manner and not solely from a predetermined menu of searchable criteria and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of

the display screen that meet the search criteria input. Wood discloses displaying a selectable search criteria and highlight function that accepts search criteria input and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the search criteria input (Figures 9 and 10 and page 5, paragraph 42). The search input involves data entry of an address by a user and is not solely from a predetermined menu of searchable criteria. The address is searched and highlighted as an icon on the map to identify the found address. The search criteria is input by the user as shown in Figure 9, where its in a data entry manner and not solely from a predetermined menu of searchable criteria. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood displaying a selectable search and highlight function that accepts search criteria input in a data entry manner and not solely from a predetermined menu of searchable criteria and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the search criteria input. Brandau discloses an interface where network elements are configured and further highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements within a system. The configuration and management of this network would benefit from a search and highlight functionality that would allow for the user to search and identify specific elements within a large and clustered network. This provides motivation for Brandau and Organ to learn from Wood. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from Wood displaying a selectable search and highlight function that accepts search criteria input in a data entry manner and not solely

from a predetermined menu of searchable criteria and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the search criteria input.

Referring to claim 13, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose that the search and highlight function accepts simultaneous input of a plurality of search criteria and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the search criteria input (Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30), where the search menu display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of search criteria that can be selected through inputs by the user with these elements being highlighted in the map structure.

Referring to claim 14, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose visually differentiating highlighted elements highlighted according to different respective search criteria (Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose highlighting elements in response to respective search criteria. The combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood also discloses that the highlighted elements are color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there being a visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map structure and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 15, Brandau discloses displaying highlighted elements in the map structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but does not disclose a highlight function that accepts highlight selection criteria input and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display

screen that meet the highlight selection criteria input. Wood discloses a highlight function that accepts highlight selection criteria input and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the highlight selection criteria input (Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30). The selection criteria input into the menu of Figure 12 results in highlighting of these criteria in the map structure of Wood. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood a highlight function that accepts highlight selection criteria input and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the highlight selection criteria input. Brandau discloses an interface where network elements are configured and further highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements within a system. The configuration and management of this network would benefit from highlighting elements in response to a highlight selection criteria functionality that would allow for the user to search and identify specific elements within a large and clustered network. This provides motivation for Brandau and Organ to learn from Wood. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from Wood a highlight function that accepts highlight selection criteria input and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the highlight selection criteria input.

Referring to claim 16, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose that the highlight function accepts simultaneous input of a plurality of highlight selection criteria and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of

the display screen that meet the highlight selection input (Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30), where the search menu display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of highlight selection criteria that can be selected simultaneously through inputs by the user with these elements being highlighted in the map structure.

Referring to claim 17, Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose visually differentiating highlighted elements highlighted according to different respective highlight selection criteria (Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood disclose highlighting elements in response to respective highlight selection criteria. The combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood also discloses that the highlighted elements are color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there being a visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map structure and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 18, Brandau discloses that the continuous panning motion comprises a drag action (column 2, lines 61-64) but does not disclose a drop action. Wood discloses a continuous panning motion that involves dragging and dropping action (page 4, paragraph 39, lines 1-4), where clicking and moving comprises the dragging action and releasing the mouse button comprises the drop action. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action. Both Brandau and Wood disclose traversing a display area by carrying out a continuous panning motion involving drag action with Wood further

describing a drop action. The drop action is carried out in Wood in response to the drag action where after dragging, the drop action is carried out to end the interaction process. In response to the mouse click, initiating the dragging, the drop action would occur when the mouse is unclicked. Therefore in view of the drag operation in Brandau, the drop action would be obvious. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action.

Referring to claim 19, Brandau discloses that the continuous panning motion comprises a drag action (column 2, lines 61-64) but does not disclose a drop action. Wood discloses a continuous panning motion that involves dragging and dropping action (page 4, paragraph 39, lines 1-4), where clicking and moving comprises the dragging action and releasing the mouse button comprises the drop action. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action. Both Brandau and Wood disclose traversing a display area by carrying out a continuous panning motion involving drag action with Wood further describing a drop action. The drop action is carried out in Wood in response to the drag action where after dragging, the drop action is carried out to end the interaction process. In response to the mouse click, initiating the dragging, the drop action would occur when the mouse is unclicked. Therefore in view of the drag operation in Brandau, the drop action would be obvious. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandau, Organ, Wood and U. S. Publication No. 2003/0142117 A1 (Chong et al.), herein referred to as Chong.

Referring to claim 2, Brandau does not disclose a graphical switch on the display that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated. Wood discloses a graphical means through which the user can switch to activate the panning window interface or to inactivate the panning window interface (Figure 7 and page 4, paragraph 36, lines 1-6), where the selection of the menu item allows for switching between activation and inactivation of the panning window interface. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood to disclose a graphical switch on the display that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated. Providing a graphical means through which the user can choose to activate or inactive the panning window interface provides more user control over the interface. The user of Brandau's display would benefit from having control over the activation status of the panning window interface when the interface is provided with large amounts of data that needs attention at any particular time. When the user would desire to switch the panning window interface activation status, the switch can occur in response to the user's desire. This would motivate Brandau and Organ to learn from Wood to implement a graphical switch means. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from Wood to disclose a graphical switch on the display that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated.

Brandau, Organ and Wood do not disclose that inactivation of the panning window interface removes the panning window from the display and enlarges the high-level map structure panel. Chong discloses that inactivation of the panning window removes the panning window from the display and enlarges the high-level map structure panel (Figures 2, 3 and page 2, paragraphs 21-24). Once the panning window determines the zoom area, the panning window is no longer needed and is inactive in response to which the panning window is removed and the high-level map is enlarged. It would have obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Chong that inactivation of the panning window interface removes the panning window from the display and enlarges the high-level map structure panel. In the combination of Brandau, Organ and Wood when the panning option is inactivated there is no measure taken to remove the panning window which clearly isn't necessary once the panning option is inactive. The removal of the panning window allows the user to clearly view the map data. This provides motivation for Brandau, Organ and Wood to learn from Chong. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from Chong that inactivation of the panning window interface removes the panning window from the display and enlarges the high-level map structure panel.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 6/20/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Although Brandau does not disclose test flow systems there is motivation for Brandau to learn from Organ to display test flow diagrams from test flow systems. Brandau discloses that diagrams with large number of nodes can be hard to view and would benefit from a detailed view provided by a panning window. The test flow diagram displayed in Organ is such a diagram with many nodes. Therefore there is motivation for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Organ display test flow diagrams with test flow systems.

Applicant argues that Wood does not disclose a graphical switch that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Brandau and Wood disclose that a graphical switch that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated. Wood discloses how a graphical switch option is provided to activate or inactive a panning function. In Brandau, that panning function includes status of a panning window. Therefore, the graphical switch which activates or inactivates the panning function in Wood, would activate or inactive the panning window in Brandau. Both Brandau and Wood disclose panning function, with Wood providing additional option to the user to turn on or off this function as needed by the user. This extra option provides motivation for Brandau to learn from Wood so that the user may control the user interface as desired. Therefore, the combination of Brandau and Wood disclose a graphical switch that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated. Claim 2 has been further amended to add another reference, Chong to reject the claims. In view of the amendments including, whereby inactivation of the

panning window interface removes the panning window from the display and enlarges the high-level map structure panel, claim 2 has been rejected as a combination of Brandau, Wood and Chong. Chong discloses that inactivation of the panning window interface removes the panning window from the display and enlarges the high-level map structure panel.

Applicant argues that Wood does not disclose a search and highlight function that allows input of a search criteria and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the input search criteria. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wood provides multiple options (Figures 9 and 12) where a menu is provided, allowing the user to input search criteria. In response to this input, a search is conducted and the matching results are highlighted on the map. The menu in Figure 9 provides address fields where the user can manually input an address in response to which a search and highlight process is conducted.

Applicant argues that Wood does not disclose a drag and drop functionality. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Brandau does disclose the moving of the panning window which would include dragging and dropping this panning window at a new location. Brandau does not discuss a drop function although it is inherent in a panning continuous motion that involves moving a panning window from one location to another location. Wood clearly discloses in paragraph 39 first clicking on a mouse and moving the cursor which reads on a drag operation. Furthermore, releasing the mouse button reads on a drop

operation. Therefore, Wood discloses a drag and drop functionality that is associated with a panning function. See page 4, paragraph 39.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Responses to this action should be submitted as per the options cited below: The United States Patent and Trademark Office requires most patent related correspondence to be: a) faxed to the Central Fax number (571-273-8300) b) hand carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in 37 CFR 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA

22313-1450), or d) transmitted to the Office using the Office's Electronic Filing System.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (571) 272-4054. The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571) 272-4057.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Namitha Pillai
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2173
February 17, 2009

/Namitha Pillai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173